



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/811,361	03/04/1997	MOLLY F. KULESZ-MARTIN	RPP.135F-US	1038

7590 07/30/2002
MICHAEL L DUNN
PO BOX 96
NEWFANE, NY 14108

EXAMINER

YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/811,361	KULESZ-MARTIN, MOLLY F.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher H Yaen	1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The examiner of the application has changed. This case has now been transferred as of 7/29/02. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Christopher Yaen, Group Art Unit 1642.
2. The amendment filed 4/10/2002 (paper no 21) is acknowledged and entered into the record.

Claim Rejections Withdrawn

3. The rejection of the claim 11 under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph as lacking written description is **withdrawn** in light of the amendments furnished by the applicant.

New Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific asserted utility or a well established utility.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific asserted utility or a well established utility.

The disclosed utilities for the purified p53as peptide is to study cell growth and maturation , detecting normal versus abnormal cell growth and to normalize cell growth of abnormally growing cells (see page 10 line 14-16). However, neither the

Art Unit: 1642

specification nor any art of record teaches what the purified p53as peptide is, how it functions, or a specific and well-established utility for any of the fragments claimed. Furthermore, the specification does not teach a relationship to any specific disease or establish any involvement in the etiology of any specific disease. The asserted utility of the purified p53as protein is based on the assertion that p53as peptide (SEQ ID NO:6 and 7) is structurally similar to mouse and human p53.

The specification further proposes, based on sequence similarity to p53, that the p53 as peptide will have similar biological effects and activities (page 10, line 14-16). However, evidence based on protein sequence homology does not alone permit extrapolation to an isolated amino acid's biological function or use thereof. Bowie et al (Science, 1990, 257:1306-1310) teach that an amino acid sequence encodes a message that determines the shape and function of a protein and that it is the ability of these proteins to fold into unique three-dimensional structures that allows them to function and carry out the instructions of the genome and further teaches that the problem of predicting protein structure from sequence data and in turn utilizing predicted structural determinations to ascertain functional aspects of the protein is extremely complex. (col 1, p. 1306). Bowie et al further teach that while it is known that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the position within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of maintaining function are limited. Certain positions in the sequence are critical to the three dimensional structure/function relationship and these regions can tolerate only conservative substitutions or no substitutions (col 2, p. 1306). The

Art Unit: 1642

sensitivity of proteins to alterations of even a single amino acid in a sequence are exemplified by Burgess et al (J of Cell Bio. 111:2129-2138, 1990) who teach that replacement of a single lysine residue at position 118 of acidic fibroblast growth factor by glutamic acid led to the substantial loss of heparin binding, receptor binding and biological activity of the protein. Further, Scott et al (Nature Genetics, 1999, 21:440-443) teach that the gene causing Pendred syndrome encodes a putative transmembrane protein designated pendrin. Based on sequence similarity data, the authors postulated that the putative protein was deemed to be a member of the p53 gene family sulfate transport proteins that included a 29% identity to rat sulfate-anion transporter, 32% similarity to human diastrophic dysplasia sulfate transporter, and 45% similarity to the human sulfate transporter 'downregulated in adenoma'. However, upon analyzing the expression and kinetics of the protein, the data revealed no evidence of sulfate transport wherein results revealed that pendrin functioned as a transporter of chloride and iodide. Scott et al. suggest that these results underscore the importance of confirming the function of newly identified gene products even when the database searches reveal significant homology to proteins of known function (page 411, 1st column, 4th paragraph). These references demonstrate that even a single amino acid substitution will often dramatically affect the biological activity and characteristics of a protein. It cannot be predicted, based on the information in the specification, what effect this difference has on the function of the protein. Further even if the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:6 and 7 are structurally similar to p53, neither the specification nor any art of record teaches what the polypeptide is, what it does, nor teaches a relationship to any

Art Unit: 1642

specific disease or establish any involvement of the polypeptide in the etiology of any specific disease or teach which fragments might be active as claimed in a pharmaceutical composition.

In addition, Bork (Genome Research, 2000,10:398-400) clearly teaches the pitfalls associated with comparative sequence analysis for predicting protein function because of the known error margins for high-throughput computational methods. Bork specifically teaches that computational sequence analysis is far from perfect, despite the fact that sequencing itself is highly automated and accurate (p. 398, col 1). One of the reasons for the inaccuracy is that the quality of data in public sequence databases is still insufficient. This is particularly true for data on protein function. Protein function is context dependent, and both molecular and cellular aspects have to be considered (p. 398, col 2). Conclusions from the comparison analysis are often stretched with regard to protein products (p. 398, col 3). Furthermore, recent studies show that alternative splicing might affect more than 30% of human genes and the number of known post-translational modifications of gene products is increasing constantly so that complexity at protein level is enormous. Each of these modifications may change the function of respective gene products drastically (p. 399, col 1). Further, although gene annotation via sequence database searches is already a routine job, even here the error rate is considerable (p. 399, col 2). Most features predicted with an accuracy of greater than 70% are of structural nature and at best only indirectly imply a certain functionality (see legend for table 1, page 399). As more sequences are added and as errors accumulate and propagate it becomes more difficult to infer correct function from the many

Art Unit: 1642

possibilities revealed by database search (p. 399 para bridging cols 2 and 3). The reference finally cautions that although the current methods seem to capture important features and explain general trends, 30% of those feature are missing or predicted wrongly. This has to be kept in mind when processing the results further (p. 400, para bridging cols 1 and 2). Clearly, given not only the teachings of Bowie et al, Scott et al and Burgess et al but also the limitations and pitfalls of using computational sequence analysis and the unknown effects of alternative splicing, post translational modification and cellular context on protein function as taught by Bork, any dissimilarity, to murine or human p53, the function of the SEQ ID NO:6 and 7 polypeptide could not be predicted, based on sequence similarity with p53, nor would it be expected to be the same as that of murine or human p53.

The specification essentially gives an invitation to experiment wherein the artisan is invited to elaborate a functional use for the disclosed polypeptide and fragments thereof. Because the claimed invention is not supported by a specific asserted utility for the reasons set forth, credibility of any utility cannot be assessed.

Claim 11 also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1642

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher H Yaen whose telephone number is 703-305-3586. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Christopher Yaen
Art Unit 1642
July 27, 2002


ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600